

PRESIDENT: Is there an objection? Seeing none, it is so ordered. Item (b), LB 186. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would like to speak just briefly on LB 186. LB 186 is a bill introduced by Senator Bereuter and Senator Cullan to accomplish some of the purposes which we outlined yesterday which is principally a retrenchment from the position adopted by this body two years ago. The bill was discussed between myself and Senator Bereuter to some extent prior to its introduction. Senator Bereuter, at that time, indicated to me that he would like to have me sign the bill with him. I told him that I would be willing to do so if I had the time to study the bill and if I approved of the concept of the bill. As I outlined yesterday, there is some concern on my part about the fact that the bill still contains provisions which allow too much authority to certain subdivisions of government. But at this time, I do not choose to continue the process by which I might ask for re-referral. I will discuss the bill in greater detail at a later time, and again at this time with your approval, I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion on LB 186.

PRESIDENT: Is there an objection? Seeing none, it is so ordered. Item (c), re-refer LB 434. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: LB 434, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, is a bill introduced by the Committee on Agriculture and Environment. The bill was introduced for the purpose of limiting or eliminating the State Office of Planning and Programming from any activity in the area of land use planning. I think if you will study the bills that we have previously discussed, that is the principal point of all of those bills. It is a recognition by the introducers of those bills that the State Office of Planning and Programming and Mr. Don Nelson, who served by the appointment of the Governor, went far beyond the intent of this Legislature in providing assistance to the cities and counties in the area of land use planning. I believe that it is the intention of the introducers of the previous bills to limit the activity of that office. I believe that it is wise for this Legislature to, therefore, remove from that office the responsibility of land use planning on a statewide basis and Senator Bereuter has outlined that he felt that those bills that dealt with land use planning on a statewide basis should properly go to the committee on Agriculture and Environment. It is an Agriculture Committee bill and as such we do have some interest. I would hope, as I pointed out yesterday, you would recognize that unless there is understanding between city and rural interest, unless there is an attempt made to not impose upon the rural interest the wishes of the people of the urban area, that you would recognize the responsibility that those of us have on the committee on Agriculture and Environment to have input into the area of land use planning. I was amazed when I recounted the votes yesterday to notice that I believe the motion that I made received one vote from the City of Lincoln and two from the City of Omaha. I fail to recall very many instances when there was that much of a rural-urban split in this Legislature. I wonder if the chairmanship of the two committees resolve in different hands if the vote would have been different. I would just like to say in closing, and